

REMARKS

The April 14, 2006 Office Action regarding the above-identified application has been carefully considered; and the claim amendments above together with the remarks that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to respond thereto and address all issues raised in that Action. Essentially, the claims have been amended above in order to take allowable subject matter and obviate the rejections set forth in the Action. Hence, it is believed that this case is in condition for allowance, and prompt favorable reconsideration of this amended application is requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 32-35 and the Examiner's indication that claims 2-4, 9-12 and 25-31 would be allowable if recast in independent form.

The recitation of claim 2 has been moved up into independent claim 1 (and claim 2 has been cancelled). Hence, claim 1 should now be allowable as was previous claim 2. Claims 3-5 now depend directly from 1 and should be allowable as indicated. Claims 5-8 and 14-24 depend from claim 1 (former claim 2) and should now be allowable with the amended independent claim.

New claim 49 includes the cavity and control circuitry, like in original claim 1. Claim 1 also recites LEDs, somewhat like in claim 5. Of note, claim 49 specifically recites a deflector, as in the previous version of claim 2, which was found patentable over the art. Hence, new claim 49 and new dependent claims 50-54 also should be allowable over the art.

Claim 9 has been recast in independent form by incorporating the recitations of original independent claim 1 and intervening claim 5. Similarly, claim 10 has been recast in independent form by incorporating the recitations of original independent claim 1 and intervening claim 5. Claims 11-13 continue to depend from claim 10. Claims 9-12 therefore should be allowable as

indicated by the Examiner, and claim 13 should be allowable together with parent independent claim 10.

Claim 39 is a new independent claim. Like claim 9, claim 39 includes recitations regarding initially inactive light emitting diodes. It is believed that claim 39 and dependent claims 40-43 should be allowable for reasons generally similar to claim 9.

Claim 44 also is a new independent claim. Like claim 10, claim 44 includes recitations regarding a color sensor and logic circuitry. In claim 44 the logic circuitry is responsive to the detected color to control output intensities so as to provide a desired color distribution with respect to the combined light. It is believed that claim 44 and dependent claims 45-48 should be allowable for reasons generally similar to claim 10.

Each of claims 25-29 have been recast in independent form by incorporating the recitations of original independent claim 1. New claims 36-38 depend from claim 29 and should be allowable therewith.

New claim 55 relates to an apparatus for emitting light, which includes a cavity and LEDs emitting lights of different colors. However, like 29, new claim 55 requires emissions at points on the interior surface of the integrating cavity not directly visible through the aperture. Hence, it is believed that new claim 55 is patentable for reasons generally similar to allowable claim 29.

As noted above, the Action suggested that claims 30 and 31 would be allowable if recast in independent form. Claim 30 has been recast as an independent claim from which claim 31 depends. Hence, claims 30 and 31 should be allowable.

In response to the indefiniteness rejection of claim 13, the claim has been amended to change its dependency. Claim 13 now depends from claim 11, which provides an antecedent recitation for the "inactive light emitting diodes."

Hence, pending claims 1 and 3-55 should all be definite as well as novel and patentable over the art, in view of the indication of allowable subject matter in the Action. The art rejection should be moot in view of the amendments above to take subject matter that the Examiner identified as patentable over the art. Accordingly, this case should now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicants respectfully request a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the April 14, 2006 Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8603 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: June 20, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**